

Remarks/Arguments

Reconsideration of this application is requested.

Extension of Time

A request for a one month extension of the period within which to respond to the office action mailed on August 26, 2004 is enclosed. The extended period for response expires on December 27, 2004.

Claim Status

Claims 1-6 were previously presented in this application. Claims 1 and 2 are amended, and claim 7 is added. Accordingly, after entry of this amendment, claims 1-7 are pending.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 103(a)

Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as obvious over Yoon (USP 6,697,083) in view of Meins (USP 6,587,700). In response, applicant submits that independent claims 1 and 2, as amended, and independent claim 5, as originally filed, clearly distinguish over these references.

Claim 1 recites “a first illuminator which illuminates the first display” and “a second illuminator which illuminates the second display”. Claim 1 further recites that electric power is supplied “to the first illuminator only when the second case is in the open position” and “to the second illuminator only when the second case is in the closed position”. These limitations are not disclosed or suggested by Yoon, Meins, or any combination thereof.

Yoon discloses a transparent LCD having only a single, two-sided display screen that is transparent without a reflecting plate. Since the transparent LCD has no reflecting plate, displayed images are simultaneously viewable on both sides(front and back sides) of the transparent LCD. According to Yoon, the front (inner) display screen is viewed in an open status of the folder, whereas the rear (outer) display screen is viewed in a closed status of the folder. When the folder is in the open status, the image is displayed on the transparent LCD in a normal display status so as to be viewable from the front display screen. Alternately, when

the folder is in the closed status, the image is displayed on the transparent LCD in an inverted display status so as to be viewable from the rear display screen. The term "status inverting operation" means that an inverted display of the image is displayed on the transparent LCD. *See Yoon from column 3, line 9 to column 5, line 59.* Thus, the single, two-sided, transparent display screen of Yoon is illuminated by a single illuminator that simultaneously illuminates both display screens regardless of whether the folder is in an open or closed status. Meins only teaches the use of one display screen, which fails to remedy the deficiencies of Yoon.

In contrast, claim 1 requires a portable radio communication apparatus having first and second displays, a first illuminator which illuminates the first display, and a second illuminator which illuminates the second display, wherein electric power is supplied to the first illuminator only when the second case is in the open position, and electric power is supplied to the second illuminator only when the second case is in the closed position. Yoon does not disclose or suggest any of these features, and Meins does not remedy the deficiencies of Yoon.

Claim 2 has been similarly amended to recite "wherein the first display is illuminated only when the second case is in the open position, and wherein the second display is illuminated only when the second case is in the closed position". As discussed above, Yoon teaches a single, two-sided, transparent display having two display screens that are simultaneously illuminated regardless of whether the folder is in an open or closed status. Meins specifically teaches only one display screen, and fails to remedy the deficiencies of Yoon.

Claim 5 recites "a controller which controls the display controller for directing display driving supply to turn off the second display if the open/closed position detector has detected the second case being in the open position". As previously discussed, Yoon specifically teaches a single transparent display having two screens that are simultaneously illuminated regardless of whether the folder is in an open or closed status. Meins fails to remedy the deficiencies of Yoon.

Appl. No. 09/768,712
Amdt. Dated December 21, 2004
Reply to Office Action of August 26, 2004

Attorney Docket No. 81922.0005
Customer No.: 26021

Since Yoon and Meins do not, taken alone or in combination, disclose or suggest each and every element of independent claims 1, 2, and 5, those claims are not rendered obvious by Yoon in view of Meins. The rejections of claims 1-6 under 35 USC 103 should be withdrawn.

New Claim

New claim 7, dependent from claim 5, is added by this amendment and distinguishes over the art of record.

Conclusion

This application is now believed to be in condition for allowance. The examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned to resolve any issues that remain after entry of this amendment. Any fees due with this response may be charged to our Deposit Account No. 50-1314.

Respectfully submitted,
HOGAN & HARTSON L.L.P.

Date: December 21, 2004

By: 
Troy M. Schmelzer
Registration No.36,667
Attorney for Applicant(s)

500 South Grand Avenue, Suite 1900
Los Angeles, California 90071
Phone: 213-337-6700
Fax: 213-337-6701